

Gaithersburg Day Laborer Task Force Meeting
March 23, 2006, 7:30 p.m.
Casey Community Center, Room B

I. Approval of Summary of 3/14/06 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the March 14, 2006 summary of the Gaithersburg Day Laborer Task Force meeting. The motion passed.

II. Final Review and Vote on Option 1 for Inclusion in Options Report

In reviewing Option 1, task force members expressed concern in regard to the capability of establishing a center so quickly. Subsequently, they identified the need for a temporary location, which they characterized as a safety net. In order to further define this recommendation, the task force agreed to remove Option 1 (#2) in its entirety and further develop it to serve as a stand-alone statement that would apply to all other options. Joe Clark agreed to further develop the statement and email it to task for members for review.

Other changes included:

- Option 1 (#1) added a period after “contractors” and deleted remainder of sentence.
- Inadvertent deletion of Option 1 (#7) referencing “identification cards” was reinserted.
- It was noted that Option 1 Cons (#3) (first sentence) could also be viewed as a pro and as such would remain under Cons and be listed as #15 under Pros. Remaining sentences in Option 1 Cons (#3) were deleted.
- Option 1 Cons (#9) sentence in parenthesis was deleted.

A vote followed the review of the options. As previously agreed, members who were absent would have an opportunity to vote on the amended document via email. The results shown below for Options 1, 3, & 10 include the vote of the absent task force member.

Results of vote by full Task Force on Option 1 as amended:

8 - in Favor

6 - Opposed

1 - Abstained

III. Review Option 3 for Inclusion in Options Report

Changes were made as follows:

- In the last sentence of the Option 3 introduction, the reference to “Option 2” was changed to “Option 3.”
- Option 3 (#6) the word “council” was changed to “counsel.”

- The first sentence of Option 3 (#10) was deleted and replaced with Option 3 Pros (#24 b).
- In the second sentence of Option 3 (#10), a space was inserted between the words “center” and “can.”
- The third sentence of Option 3 (#10) was deleted and replaced with Option 3 Pros (#24 a).
- Option 3 (# 17) word “of” was deleted.
- Option 3 Pros (#24) deleted in its entirety.
- Option 3 Cons (#3) delete second sentence (in parenthesis).
- Option 3 Cons (#5) replace word “Ties...” with “Could be perceived as tying...” and delete remaining sentences (in parenthesis).
- Option 3 Cons (#8) change wording from “county centers appear to foster” to “county day labor centers may foster.”
- Option 3 Cons (#8) delete second sentence (in parenthesis).
- Option 3 Cons (#22) delete “I have seen” from second sentence. And rearrange second sentence to read, “By hiring counts it appears as though a saturation point, in terms of available jobs, has been reached.”
- Option 3 Cons (#22) following second sentence, move all sentences (in parenthesis) to Option 3 Pros.
- Option 3 Cons (#23) delete in its entirety.

Results of vote by full Task Force on Option 3 as amended:

5 - in Favor

10 - Opposed

IV. Review Option 10 for Inclusion in Options Report

Changes were made as follows:

- Option 10 last sentence of introductory paragraph was deleted.
- Option 10 (#4) add at end of first sentence, “with roots in the City of Gaithersburg.”
- Option 10 (#6) add to the first sentence following “faith-based organization” the phrase, “with roots in the City of Gaithersburg” and delete the next three words, “in the City.”
- Option 10 (#11) delete in its entirety.
- Add Option 1 (#18) [old #13] to Option 10 and preface with “Any center...”
- Option 10 Pros (#1) replace words “position paper” with “model policy.”
- Option 10 Pros (#2) add period after center and delete “not run by City” shown in parenthesis.

Results of vote by full Task Force on Option 10 as amended:

7 - in Favor 8 - Opposed

V. Final Review and Vote on Dissenting Opinion for Option B Research Report

A vote was taken in regard to including the Dissenting Opinion in Option B. A vote was taken and 5 members approved including the Dissenting Opinion. As this vote exceeded the minimum number of four votes needed, the Dissenting Opinion would be added to the Option B Research Report.”

Following the vote a discussion ensued as to whether Option B should be reopened and voted on in one of its earlier forms, as multiple changes had been made to the document in hopes of gaining consensus.

A motion was made not to go back to review and recast votes on the Option B Research Report.

Results:

5 - in Favor (of **not** reopening the Option B Research report for review and a recasting votes).

3 - Opposed

6 - Abstained

Concern was expressed that the dissenting opinion, rather than focusing solely on opposing specific information in the Option B Report, was used as a means of introducing new information. Conversely, it was noted that new information could be submitted as an addendum.

A motion was made to let the Option B Research Report stand as currently written and to let the dissenting report stand as currently written. The motion passed.

Results:

7 - in Favor

5 - Opposed

2 – Abstained

VI. Vote on Charge #4 Site Criteria

Task force member Mike Wiencek noted that the Charge #4 document that was presented for a vote reflected input from all members that had submitted responses.

The task force reviewed Charge #4 and modified it as follows:

- Page 3, under “Pedestrian and Vehicle Access and Transportation Criteria”, fourth bullet, second sub-bullet: after “...conflicting other zones, land uses, homeowners, businesses, etc.” Add, “However, wherever possible, proximity to temporary workers homes should be considered.”

A motion was made to approve the Charge #4 Report as modified. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. New Business – Plans for Next Week

Chair Prentiss Searles noted that he would work with Assistant City Manager Tony Tomasello and Olde Towne Coordinator Cindy Hines in creating the PowerPoint presentation and that he would make the presentation to the Mayor and City Council at the April 10, Mayor and Council Work Session.

Tony Tomasello described the format for the upcoming work session:

All information being submitted to Mayor and City Council must be received by April 6, 2006 for inclusion in the packets and posting to the website. On the night of the work session the task force will be allowed to make a presentation (up to 30 minutes in length). The Council will then ask questions followed by an opportunity for the public to provide input (time limited to 3 minutes per individual.)

It was noted that the task force’s recommendations would need to be reviewed by the City Attorney as well as staff in appropriate departments.

It was requested that a description of the work session be emailed to all task force members so that they would be aware of the process. It was also requested that an outline of the PowerPoint presentation be prepared and ready for distribution at Tuesday’s meeting.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.